UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,596	04/21/2004	Ki-yeon Park	5649-1286	5520
	7590 07/25/200 L SIBLEY & SAJOVE	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 37428			NADAV, ORI	
RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/828,596	PARK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ori Nadav	2811				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	/ IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS.				
 WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 M</u>	ay 2008.					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-69</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>7-10 and 16-69</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-6 and 11-15</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• •				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claimed limitation of "a metal oxide thin dielectric film", as recited in amended claim 1, is unclear as to whether said metal oxide is the same metal oxide element recited in line 6 of the claim or a different element. It is further unclear how the two metal oxide elements recited in lines 3 and 6 of the claim are structurally related to the metal oxide element recited in line 1 of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

Claims 1, 4-6 and 11-15, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al. (2003/0040196) in view of Li et al. (2005/0151210).

Lim et al. teach in figure 5C and related text a method of forming a metal thin film, comprising:

forming an oxygen-deficient metal oxide dielectric film 33 comprising La₂O₃, on a semiconductor substrate by atomic layer deposition (ALD, paragraph [0020]) using a lanthanum containing compound (paragraph [0067]);

and

forming a metal oxide dielectric film 34 on the oxygen-deficient metal oxide film by ALD using a lanthanum containing compound and an oxidizing agent.

Lim et al. do not teach forming an oxygen-deficient metal oxide film comprising La_2O_x wherein 0 < x < 3.

Li et al. teach in paragraph [0031] lanthanum oxide having oxygen deficiency.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form Lim et al.'s lanthanum oxide having oxygen deficiency in order to improve the device characteristics.

The combination is motivated by the teachings of Li et al. who point out the advantages of using the disclosed impurity species (i.e., lanthanum oxide having oxygen deficiency).

Page 4

Regarding claims 5, 12-13 and 15, Lim et al. teach:

(a) feeding the lanthanum containing compound onto the semiconductor substrate to form an adsorbed layer of the lanthanum containing compound;

- (b) removing a byproduct of (a) by means of purge; and
- (c) optionally repeating (a) and (b) until the oxygen-deficient metal oxide film with a predetermined thickness is formed, and

annealing the oxygen-deficient metal oxide film, wherein the annealing is carried out after forming the oxygen-deficient metal oxide film or after forming the metal oxide film,

wherein the annealing is carried out under an atmosphere of a gas selected from the group consisting of 02, N2, and 03, or combinations thereof, or under a vacuum atmosphere.

Regarding claims 4, 6, 11 and 14, Lim et al., do not explicitly state that the first reactant is selected from the group consisting of various tris or combinations thereof, the oxygen-deficient metal oxide film has a thickness in a range of about 5A to about 30A, wherein the method is carried out at a temperature in a range of about 200°C to about 350°C, and wherein the annealing is carried out at a temperature in a range of about 300°C to about 800°C.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a first reactant selected from the group consisting of various tris or combinations thereof, the oxygen-deficient metal oxide film has a thickness in a

range of about 5A to about 30A, wherein the method is carried out at a temperature in a range of about 200°C to about 350°C, and wherein the annealing is carried out at a temperature in a range of about 300°C to about 800°C in prior art's device in order to form the device, as taught by prior art, using conventional processing temperatures, thicknesses and materials.

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues that Lim teaches away from such an oxygen deficient metal oxide film by stressing the importance of using an oxidizing agent when forming its metal oxide films.

Lim et al. teach in paragraph [0067] that "the reaction gas may include oxygen radical or ozon". Therefore, Lim et al. do not stress the importance of using an oxidizing agent when forming its metal oxide films. Furthermore, the method disclosed by Lim et al. does not teach away from using an oxygen deficient metal oxide film.

Applicant argues that "Lim only describes stacking metal oxide films, wherein one metal oxide film is comprised of one metal MI and the other metal oxide film is comprised of a different metal M2. M1 and M2 are explicitly stated to be two different metals, and Lim provides no motivation to use the same metal as M1 and M2".

It is unclear to the examiner why Lim et al. is required to use the same metal as M1 and M2.

Applicant argues that the combination of Lim and Li is inappropriate, because Li teaches an oxygen-deficient lanthanum as an impurity species doped into a conductive oxide and as such provides no motivation to include such a compound in the dielectric metal oxide film of Lim.

Although Li et al. use an oxygen-deficient lanthanum as an impurity species doped into a conductive oxide, Li et al. explicitly state that the impurity species is "an insulator material" (see paragraph [0031], lines 1-2). Therefore, an artisan will be motivated to use the insulating material impurity species in the dielectric metal oxide film of Lim et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/828,596 Page 7

Art Unit: 2811

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ori Nadav whose telephone number is 571-272-1660.

The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern

Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lynne Gurley can be reached on 571-272-4670. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O.N. 7/26/2008 /ORI NADAV/ PRIMARY EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800